DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 303 AC 014 507

TITLE	Extension Staff Perceptions of Community Resource Development in Three States.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Cooperative Extension Service.
REPORT NO	Ext-Stud-47
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Development; Community Resources; *Comparative Analysis; Extension Agents; *Extension Education; *Interviews; Organization; Perception; *State Programs; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland; Missouri; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A report of a Community Resource Development (CRD) study in the Extension Services of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Missouri is presented. The three states represent different stages of development of CRD work, and are differently organized. The purpose of the study is to compare the three Extension organizations. Extension personnel of relative influence were interviewed personally and/or by telephone. The opinions on CRD procedures varied in the three states. Maryland preferred CRD work through the creation of multi-county development organizations. Pennsylvania differed significantly from the two other states in its orientation. Maryland and Missouri were significantly higher in their emphasis on CRD's role in the creation and reorganization of area development organization than Pennsylvania. Other findings are given. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED 078303

Extension Studies 47

Extension Staff Perceptions of Community Resource Development in Three States

The Pennsylvania State University
Cooperative Extension Service
University Park, Pennsylvania

AC014507

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EXTENSION STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THREE STATES *

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a Community Resource Development study in the Extension Services of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Missouri.

Historically, Community Development activities in the United States evolved in close association with Cooperative Extension work.[1] It is, however, only since 1955 that Community Development became an identifiably distinct, organized activity within this institution. Today approximately 18% of all Extension efforts are expended on programs of a community nature[2] and most every state has full-time staff on state, area or county levels devoted to this activity.[3] The program is unmistakably gaining in importance within Extension work.

But what is Community Development or Community Resource Development, as it is officially called by the Cooperative Extension Service?** The ECOP definition is broad and comprehensive,[4] permitting the inclusion of a great variety of activities and projects into this program. It does not tell us, however, what CD or CRD means to those who are directly and indirectly involved in it, how it is organized and how it is being implemented in actual work.

---

* Dr. E.A. Cebotarev, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada, and Dr. E.J. Brown, Professor of Rural Sociology and Assistant Director Extension Service, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

** In this report CD and CRD are referred to as CRD for consistency.

What does CRD mean to CD agents, Extension supervisors, specialists and administrators? Is there agreement on its scope, procedures and content? What is CRD's unique contribution to the overall Extension program? Where can it be most successfully implemented on county, local or on multi-county level? Should it be task or process oriented? Should it diffuse educational information or should it result into action? What are the competencies needed for the program? What is the most appropriate organizational set-up for CRD?

These and similar questions prompted this research, that has as major objectives:

1. To discover how CRD is perceived, defined and being implemented by Extension staff on various organization levels, i.e., by CRD Agents, County Agents or Chairmen, Subject-matter Specialists, Supervisors and Administrators - and how if at all, it differs from conventional Extension work.

2. To find out how Extension's organizational set-up affects CRD work and what organization arrangement is most facilitating CRD work.

The Setting of the Study

The Extension Services of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Missouri were selected for this study because they represent different stages of development and formalization of CRD work in Extension and because they are differently organized.

On one extreme is Missouri with a highly structured CRD subdivision. The department of Community and Regional Affairs - a degree-granting department - serves as an academic "home" for CD field agents. Twenty-nine full-time CD specialists located throughout the state, a full-time project leader, and a body of CD supervisor-specialists provide information, advice and support, and serve as links with other disciplines on the state level.

On the other extreme is Maryland with a relatively incipient CRD subdivision, having as main coordinator a one half-time Resource Economics specialist. Pennsylvania is on an intermediate position, with a full-time CRD coordinator or leader, one full-time CRD specialist and several other subject-matter specialists assigned part-time to work with CRD.

On the organizational side, there are also considerable differences in the three states. In Missouri, CRD work is part of the total University Extension and having access to most of the academic departments of the University for subject-matter information. The CD agents in the field, like other Extension agents in Missouri, are located on an area basis and directly responsible for CD work in their areas. In Pennsylvania and Maryland Extension is still part of the Colleges of Agriculture having different degrees of linkages with other colleges of the University. In Pennsylvania all CRD agents are located on multi-county bases, while in Maryland this pattern is alternated with having a few CD agents on county levels.

Research Procedure

To obtain the information needed for this research, Extension personnel of relative power and influential positions - in regard to CRD work - were interviewed. Extension program directors, project leaders, administrators, supervisors and a sample of specialists were interviewed personally. County agents, County Chairmen and Area Directors were contacted by telephone interview.*

Most of the CRD agents were also interviewed personally, except for a few in Missouri who sent in their responses in written form.

The period of time covered by this research is roughly the year 1969. Most of the figures and findings about activities and projects, attitudes and opinions refer to this period of time.

In the following report the results of the interviews of County Agents (Pennsylvania), County Chairmen (Maryland) and Area Directors (Missouri) are presented.

Since the purpose of this study is to compare the three Extension organizations, the findings are presented globally taking the first and second choices of agents jointly to represent the orientation of the organization.**

The first, second and third choice, as described in the following pages, refer to the first, second and third largest number of agents selecting a particular answer in each state and represent the state's CRD orientation.

---

* In this report we refer to these three types of personnel as "agents" for brevity and simplicity.

** The first and second choices on each question are summed and divided by 2 to result in the percentages in the tables presented in the appendix.

THE FINDINGS

I. Perception of CRD's Scope, Procedures and Content

How should CRD be conducted?

The opinions on CRD procedures varied in the three states. With a consensus of about one-third of the agents the following procedures were favored: Maryland preferred CRD work through the creation of multi-county development organizations. To serve in an advisory capacity to local development groups and to work with individuals (as opposed to group work) were the second and third choices of the most important CRD job in Maryland. Pennsylvania differed significantly from the two other states in its orientation.* The first choice here was indirect work, i.e., the implementation of CRD through county and other field agents. Missouri's first choice was for field CD specialists to work in an advisory capacity to local development groups, which was also the third choice in Pennsylvania (see Table 1). The work with individuals was almost evenly favored by one fifth of the agents in the three states. Maryland and Missouri were significantly higher in their emphasis on CRD's role in the creation and re-organization of area development organization than Pennsylvania. There was a relative agreement on the other questions in the three states.

---

* Whenever a significant difference is reported it is statistically significant at least at the .05 level.

Table 1 - Which is the most important job of CRD agents?

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. To work with local development oriented individuals	20	15	20
b. To work through County Agents or other field agents and be their advisor	11	29	--
c. To serve as advisor to local development oriented groups	25	21	31
d. To work with existing area development organizations	16	24	23
e. To create or help to re-organize new area development organizations	28	10	25
Table %	100	99	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

What are the main functions of CRD work?

Pennsylvania and Missouri selected providing of information on area levels as the major emphases of their CRD work. Maryland differed significantly from them by selecting the induction of action in county development organization as its first choice (see Table 2). There was a relative agreement of approximately one-fifth of the agents in the three states on CRD's role of inducing action in area development bodies and on providing information to county organizations. The training of county and other Extension field agents in CRD was mentioned only by a few agents in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

Table 2 - What should the outcomes of a good CRD program be?

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. New or re-organized active area development organizations	18	12	21
b. Well-informed area development organizations	20	33	37
c. New or re-organized active county development organizations	39	20	29
d. Well-informed county development organizations	16	25	13
e. Well-informed and competent County Agents in CRD	6	10	--
Table %	99	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

On what kinds of problems should the emphasis of CRD be?

The three states agreed that the major problem focus of CRD is on human development or on the development of human resources. The degree of emphasis on this problem, however, was significantly higher in Maryland and Missouri, while Pennsylvania's second emphasis was on agricultural development.

Development of the industrial base, including tourism and environmental problems, had a relatively low priority among the agents; less than one out of every eight agents selected this problem. The improvement of services was not mentioned a single time in Maryland and only a few times in Pennsylvania and Missouri.

Table 3 - The emphasis of Extension's CRD program should be on:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. The development of agricultural resources	14	21	--
b. The creation of development organizations	20	16	32
c. The development of the industrial base, including tourism	9	11	13
d. The improvement of services	--	13	7
e. The improvement of the environment	15	15	7
f. The development of human resources	39	25	41
Table %	97	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

What is the most important contribution of CRD agents to the program?

In Maryland and Missouri the largest emphasis was on the CRD agents organizational skill, especially on a multi-area level (see Table 4). Pennsylvania on the other hand, perceived that providing information and suggesting solutions for development problems was most important. Although the other states also selected this function, the differences between the emphases were significant. To help to interpret surveys and to serve as organization coordinators were among the third choices of the states. A slightly smaller number selected the assistance in writing and implementing plans and serving as liaison between the area and the state. Extension's non-directive orientation was clearly evident in the very small number of agents that picked the role of helping to decide what projects should be chosen in CRD programs.

Table 4 - The most important contributions of CRD agents to the program are:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. To provide information and suggest solutions to CRD problems	23	35	17
b. To help to interpret survey information	11	18	21
c. To help in formulating and writing plans	7	2	4
d. To help in implementing development plans	9	8	13
e. To serve as liaison among development organizations	14	12	13
f. To serve as liaison between the area and the state	4	2	2
g. To help to decide what projects should be done	--	7	--
h. To help to organize and to re-organize area development organizations	31	16	29
Total %	99	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

What are the most important competencies for CRD agents?

Public and human relations were perceived in the three states as the most important competencies of CRD agents. Missouri, however, placed a significantly higher emphasis on this ability than Pennsylvania and Maryland. The second largest choice of Maryland was promoting decision making, Pennsylvania selected motivation of people to action and Missouri favored community development (see Table 5). CD was also the third choice in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Communication and mass media, planning, leading discussions and promoting decision making were not perceived as important competencies of CRD

agents. Conducting of surveys evidently appears to be perceived as low priority since not a single agent in the three states selected this competency in a first or second choice.*

Table 5 - The most important areas of competency of CRD agents are:

Approaches	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Community development	16	16	21
b. Public and human relations	30	28	42
c. Communication and use of mass media	6	5	9
d. Organization - group action	11	8	6
e. Planning	7	5	2
f. Conducting surveys	--	--	--
g. Motivation (social psychology)	9	28	10
h. Leading discussion	4	3	--
i. Promoting decision making	17	7	10
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

In what field should CRD agents specialize?

There was not much agreement among agents on this point. Maryland differed significantly from the other states on this point by selecting by almost one-third "employment" as the special subject matter field. Pennsylvania, in turn, appeared also to differ significantly from Maryland and Missouri in emphasizing with the same proportion "land use" as the preferred area for CRD specialization. The greatest emphasis of Missouri, with one-third of the respondents selecting this

* However, a distinction must be made between conducting surveys and encouraging and assisting citizens to perform this role. Missouri field staff engage heavily in the latter as a tool of CD.

field, was government and political science. This area of specialization was also selected in the other states, but the extent of emphasis differed significantly* (see Table 6).

The second largest choices in Maryland were housing and education, in Pennsylvania water and sewer systems and in Missouri industrial development and economics and other social sciences. The remaining subject matter areas were negligible.

Table 6 - Specialties and subject matter fields

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Transportation and communication	--	1	--
b. Water and sewer systems	5	12	6
c. Recreation and tourism	--	7	6
d. Health	5	--	4
e. Housing	14	5	2
f. Government - political science	7	21	38
g. Employment	31	5	4
h. Land use	4	28	4
i. Industrial development	7	9	12
j. Agriculture	5	6	4
k. Youth	2	--	2
l. Economics and other social sciences	7	1	10
m. Education	13	5	6
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

* Community development as a field of academic specialization was not listed on the instrument although Missouri offers a master's degree in this field.

II. Perceptions of CRD as an Innovative Activity

To discover the degree to which CRD work is perceived as an innovation a series of questions was asked, comparing CRD with usual Extension work.

CRD subject matter requirements

About one-half of the agents in the three states thought that a good CRD program required at least some new subject matter knowledge not required for other Extension work. In Pennsylvania and Maryland, however, more than one-third of the agents expressed that almost all subject matter for CRD must be new (see Table 7). In Missouri only one-sixth of the agents took this position, apparently because being a part of the "total University Extension" system, more subject matter fields were accessible and available for their work.

Table 7 - Perceptions of requirements of innovation in CRD programs in subject matter

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. It requires a completely new subject matter	17	7	4
b. Most of the subject matter must be new	17	35	10
c. Some of the subject matter must be new	50	53	58
d. Very little new subject matter is needed	4	--	24
e. None is needed - conventional Extension subject matter is sufficient	12	4	4
Total %	100	99	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

The CRD clientele

There appeared significant differences in opinions about who the prospective CRD clients should be. In none of the states was CRD seen as directed to the same clients as usual Extension work. In Pennsylvania, Maryland and Missouri, agents thought that it should be conducted mainly among new non-farm groups and organizations. The emphasis on this point was significantly higher in Missouri, with almost two-thirds of the agents taking this position. In Pennsylvania one-half of the agents and in Maryland only one-third agreed on this question (see Table 8). About one-third of the respondents in Maryland, however, considered that CRD should be conducted mainly among farm related groups; in Pennsylvania and Missouri relatively few agents considered this a clientele of CRD.

Table 8 - To whom should CRD work be directed (clientele)

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Mainly to the same clients as in traditional Extension work	--	--	--
b. Mostly among farm-related groups, but can include some non-farm	28	15	8
c. About half and half - farm and non-farm groups	38	37	29
d. Mainly to new, non-farm groups and organizations	33	49	63
Total %	99	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

CRD methods and approaches

About two-thirds of the agents in Missouri felt that CRD needs only a few new methods and approaches. Although in the two other states about one-half of the agents held the same opinion, the emphasis in Missouri was significantly higher on this point, whereas in Pennsylvania and Maryland from one-third to one-half of the agents expressed the need for more innovation in work procedures (see Table 9). The relatively conservative stance of Missouri on this point can be explained by its higher developed CRD department which provides periodic training in CD methodology. It could be assumed that in this state many CRD methodological innovations are already a part of the on-going work. Therefore, the need for innovation appears lesser than in the other states. In general, the largest expressions of need for innovation in procedures was recorded in Maryland, followed by Pennsylvania in descending order and the smallest in Missouri.

Table 9 - On methods and procedures

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. CRD requires completely new methods	14	3	4
b. Most of the methods used in CRD must be new	41	28	10
c. CRD needs only a few new methods	41	56	72
d. Existing Extension methods are all CRD requires	4	13	13
Total %	100	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Degree of definiteness of CRD work

This question was asked to appraise how much of the knowledge about problems and procedures existing in Extension could be directly transferred into CRD work and how much, in the opinion of the agents, had yet to be discovered. A majority of the agents, over one-half in Missouri, three-quarters in Pennsylvania and four-fifths in Maryland felt that a great deal of this knowledge was still missing in Extension. Almost one-fifth in the three states thought that most of this knowledge needs to be developed. Only in Missouri did one-third of the agents think that Extension had sufficient information on what to do and how to do CRD work (see Table 10). In these responses a similar pattern with prior responses is observable - again Missouri appears expressing a lesser need for innovation than Pennsylvania and Maryland. This can indicate either that Missouri has already introduced the required innovations or that the agents on the whole are more conservative than those in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

Table 10 - Extent of definiteness and certainty in CRD work

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. We have all the information on how and on what to develop a good CRD program	--	--	--
b. We have sufficient information and "know-how" for a good CRD program	5	12	29
c. We have some information, but a great deal of what to do and how to do CRD work has to be discovered	82	75	50
d. Most of the information on how to do and what to do in CRD has to be worked out	17	13	21
Total %	94	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Background preferences for CRD agents

Over four-fifths of the agents in Pennsylvania and in Missouri preferred a person especially trained in CRD, planning and organization for the position of CRD agent, while none in Maryland saw the need for this type of training, where a resource development specialist was considered by over four-fifths of the agents as a suitable person for this job. A county agent with considerable experience in the area was selected only by a little more than one-tenth of the respondents (see Table 11). The requirements of special training for CRD agents were thus clearly expressed in the three states.

Table 11 - Background preferences for CRD agents

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. A county agent with long experience in the area.	14	12	12
b. A resource development or economic development specialist	86	7	--
c. A person especially trained in CRD, planning and organization	--	81	87
Total %	100	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Most valuable characteristics of CRD agents

This question was asked to find out whether traditionalism, conservative creativity or risk taking innovativeness were perceived as valuable characteristics of CRD agents. In Pennsylvania and Missouri about three-fourths of the agents favored conservative

creativity as the greatest asset of CRD agents. The traditional approach was favored by almost one-fourth in Pennsylvania, a few less in Missouri and even fewer in Maryland. Risk taking innovativeness was selected by over four-fifths in Maryland as the most valuable characteristic of CRD agents (see Table 12).

Table 12 - The greatest asset of CRD agents is:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. To rely on well-established Extension approaches	9	22	16
b. To be creative and try out new combinations of the above	--	74	79
c. To be innovative and try out new approaches altogether	91	4	4
Total %	100	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

III. Agents' Attitudes Toward Change and Risk Involving Behavior

A series of questions was asked to obtain the agents' own attitudes toward risk involving behavior and perception of change.

Change perceived as improvement

Over one-half of the agents in the three states disagreed with the idea that change means improvement; however, almost as many viewed change favorably (see Table 13). The most conservative group on this question was Missouri and the most change oriented was Pennsylvania. Differences between the states were not significant.

Table 13 - The agents' perception of change.

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
Viewing change as an improvement:			
a. Strongly agreed	--	--	--
b. Agreed	46	47	38
c. Disagreed	54	51	58
d. Strongly disagreed	--	2	4
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Preferences of certainty over trial of new activities

There was a strong agreement on the need of trying out new, risk involving activities in all states. Missouri, however, with almost a perfect agreement on this point had a significantly higher emphasis than Pennsylvania, that again was significantly higher than Maryland. In Maryland over one-third of the agents preferred trial and established activities over experimenting with new ones and in Pennsylvania about one-fourth agreed with this position (see Table 14).

Need of knowing that new procedures "work" before taking a chance on them

All the agents in Missouri disagreed with this statement, indicating that the organization favors experimentations and trial of new methods. Pennsylvania was again significantly higher on the innovation facilitating side than Maryland where over one-third of the agents agreed that one needed to be certain of a procedure before trying it out (see Table 15).

Table 15 - One needs to know that things work before taking a chance on them

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Strongly agreed	9	--	--
b. Agreed	27	11	--
c. Disagreed	64	78	100
d. Strongly disagreed	--	12	--
Total %	100	101	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

The agent's acceptance of change in Extension

To gather some information about how much change within Extension was acceptable to agents a question about new programs was asked. In Missouri and Pennsylvania the attitudes of agents were quite similar, with about two-thirds favoring old programs over new ones and only one-third taking the position that new programs should be given priority over old ones. In Maryland the agents were divided in half, one-half preferring old programs and the other favoring new ones (see Table 16).

Table 16 - The agent's acceptance of change in Extension:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
New programs should be given priority over old ones			
a. Strongly agreed	--	3	--
b. Agreed	50	31	33
c. Disagreed	32	66	63
d. Strongly disagreed	18	--	4
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Extent of change needed in Extension for successfully working with new programs and new clients

A majority of the agents, from three-fourths to four-fifths, thought that Extension should maintain present ways of operation to be successful with new programs and reaching new clientele. Only a few in Maryland and Pennsylvania recommended to do things as in "old times." In Maryland, however, almost one-fifth of the agents thought that Extension needs to make some changes, with only one-tenth of the agents in Pennsylvania taking this stance, whereas about one-third of the agents in Missouri recommended changes in Extension (see Table 17).

Table 17 - To work successfully with new programs and clients, Extension needs:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. To do things as in "old times"	9	3	--
b. To maintain present way of doing things	73	87	71
c. To make some changes in its programs	18	10	25
d. To make basic changes in its programs	--	--	4
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Criteria for a good program for low income farmers

The opinions of agents in the three states on this question were quite similar. Only a few agents in the three states felt that a good program for small, low income farmers should give him information about how to improve his farm and encourage him to stay in farming. Less than one-fourth of the agents thought it should consist in

helping him to develop his farm into a better business. Over three-fourths felt that it should help him with his farming enterprise but should also include information on existing social trends and on alternatives to farming. Only one agent suggested that the program should encourage farmers to leave farming (see Table 18).

Table 18 - A good program for low income farmers should:

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Give him information on farm improvement and encourage him to stay on the farm	4	3	4
b. To help him develop his farm into a business	14	23	9
c. To explain existing social trends and teach alternatives to farming	82	72	87
d. To give some information as in "c" and encourage him to leave farming	--	2	--
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

IV. Perceptions of Intra-Organization Norms in Extension

The information presented in this section was gathered with the purpose of obtaining some notion about the type of norms that are shared by the agents within Extension.

The work orientation of Extension agents

The work orientation of Extension agents was very similar in the three states. Over four-fifths of the agents were oriented toward their clients: people and local leaders (see Table 19). The opinions of other Extension colleagues and one's professional peers were

mentioned as important by less than one-tenth of the agents. Extension specialists were selected as reference persons less times than the agents' non-Extension friends, and Extension's supervisor opinions were considered as important only by a few in Pennsylvania and Missouri.

Table 19 - The work orientation of County Agents

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Toward the opinion of people and clients	45	43	39
b. Toward the opinion of other Extension colleagues	7	6	13
c. Toward the opinion of local leaders and officials	41	40	32
d. Toward the opinion of Extension specialists	--	3	2
e. Toward the opinion of one's professional peers	7	2	4
f. Toward the opinion of Extension supervisors	--	5	10
g. Toward the opinion of non-Extension friends	--	1	--
Total %	100	100	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Types of non-material reward received from Extension work

The opinions of agents in the three states were very similar. Almost one-half considered that the greatest reward received from Extension work came from their beliefs in the worthiness of Extension goals and from the possibility of contributing to their attainment. About one-fifth considered that the opportunities of meeting people were most rewarding. About the same number took pride in being part of the University. Prestige in the community, time for other

activities and professional growth fared lower in the agents' preferences (see Table 20). It was only in Missouri that about one-fifth of the agents perceived professionalization as a reward in Extension work.

Table 20 - Types of non-material reward received from Extension work

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Bei g part of the University	21	10	15
b. Prestige in the community	9	7	2
c. Association with Extension professionals	2	6	2
d. Time for other activities	--	5	--
e. Opportunity to meet people (and help them)	18	22	16
f. Opportunity for professional growth	7	10	19
g. The belief in the worthiness of Extension goals and being part in their implementation	43	40	45
Total %	100	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Programs preferred by the Extension state staff

Almost one-half of the agents in the three states agreed that the Extension state staff prefer programs aimed at reaching new clientele without neglecting established ones. Programs suggested by the state staff attempting to reach new clients, which may involve some neglect of old clientele, were the second largest choice in Pennsylvania and Maryland. Missouri, however, differed significantly on its second largest choice when over one-third of the agents felt that innovative programs which were not suggested by the Extension state staff are the preferred ones. These findings seem to suggest

that in Missouri the state staff encourages agents' initiative and innovativeness over compliance to organizational norms significantly more than this is done in Pennsylvania and in Maryland (see Table 21).

Table 21 - Perception of preferred programs by the state Extension staff

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Programs containing high number of traditional activities	14	10	4
b. Programs reaching new clients without neglecting old ones	46	38	44
c. Suggested programs reaching new clients involving no neglect of old ones	23	33	15
d. Not suggested programs reaching new clients with some neglect of old ones .	14	18	37
Total %	97	99	100
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Prestige assigned by agents to Extension activities

In the prestige rating of Extension activities Pennsylvania and Maryland show a very similar pattern. Work with traditional programs was rated by about one-third of the agents as most prestigeful; it was followed in importance by work with lay community leaders. Work with local government was considered in the third place. In Missouri prestige was assigned by first place to work with lay community leaders; in second and third place, to work with local government and government agencies (see Table 22). It is evident from these findings

that in Missouri's Extension work there is a greater emphasis on newer Extension areas, such as government and government-related work and a greater tendency away from traditional programs than in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

Table 22 - Perception of prestigefulness of Extension activities

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. To work in traditional programs	30	32	10
b. To work in industrial development	2	6	4
c. To work with local government	25	16	27
d. To work with lay community leaders	22	28	33
e. To work with government agencies	14	3	21
f. To work with civil organizations	--	5	--
Total % *	93	100	95
	N=22	N=68	N=24

* Some of the % do not amount to 100 because there were a few other choices, too small to appear on this table.

Types of programs rewarded in Extension

There was not much agreement on what programs are rewarded by Extension. In answering the question about what programs could bring agents a promotion or a salary raise, about one-fourth in Maryland and in Pennsylvania said they did not know and that they would like to know. "If I knew what they want I sure would be doing it" was a frequent comment. About one-fifth of the agents in these two states thought that high quality, in-depth programs are rewarded. Tangible, reportable programs and programs designed to reach broad clientele were mentioned in second and third place. Only a few mentioned

progressive and innovative programs in Pennsylvania and Maryland (see Table 23). In Missouri the pattern was different. One-fourth of the respondents agreed that programs directed to reach a broad clientele are favored by the administration. Almost one-fifth of the agents mentioned high quality and innovative programs as having high administration approval. In third place were reportable, tangible programs. It can be concluded from these findings that in Missouri organization preferences are better communicated to the field agents than in Maryland and in Pennsylvania since only four percent did not know what the preferred programs were. A greater emphasis on innovation is also observed in this state where no agent mentioned traditional programs as compared with one-tenth of those in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

Table 23 - Perceptions of types of Extension programs rewarded by the administration

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. A high quality, specialized, in-depth program	22	19	17
b. A program which the organization is "pushing"	13	9	4
c. A program directed to reach a broad clientele	5	14	25
d. Tangible, reportable programs	14	6	12
e. Don't know - would like to know	28	27	4
f. Numbers - lots of statistical figures	--	5	4
g. Planning and pre-planning with publicity	--	5	--
h. Progressive, innovative programs	4	3	17
i. Traditional - agricultural programs	10	9	--
j. Nothing - no answer	4	8	16
Total %	100	100	99
	N=22	N=68	N=24

Satisfaction with reporting forms

We included some questions on satisfaction with reporting forms because at the time of this research Missouri was already on EMIS, while Pennsylvania and Maryland were still in the implementing stage. The time seemed appropriate for comparison. There were no significant differences, however.

About one-third of the agents in Missouri and Maryland were dissatisfied with the existing forms while only one-fifth of the agents in Pennsylvania felt this way. Many of the agents who said they were satisfied with the reporting forms added that all reporting forms are deficient in some ways and that one could not expect to be able to report all the activities involved in Extension work.

Among the activities which were difficult to report, the following were mentioned, in decreasing order: background work and preparation of projects; qualitative behavioral changes; counseling and working with individuals; administrative duties and other activities (see Table 24).

Table 24 - Satisfaction with reporting forms

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
Subjects difficult to report on present forms			
Yes	64	80	70
No	36	20	30
a. Background activities, preparation of projects	18	10	13
b. Counseling - work with individuals	9	2	--
c. Qualitative work and behavioral changes	9	6	9
d. Administrative activities	--	2	4
e. Other	--	--	4
Total %	36	20	30

Perceived leadership behavior within Extension

There are two leadership functions that are important for organizational change and innovation. These functions are not very much needed when the organization is acting in a stable society. During times of rapid social change organization must frequently adjust to new social problems. In a time like this the two leadership functions are very important for the organization's proper adjustment.

One of the leadership functions is to establish a proper organizational climate, that is, an environment of high trust, respect and consideration among members of the organization. This climate of fellowship facilitates internal communication flow, informal consultation and exchange of ideas, permitting more organization members to contribute to the organization's goal.

The second leadership function is one of setting broad guidelines to action. It consists in providing direction for programs, broadly delimiting responsibilities and explaining and justifying innovational need. Both of these leadership functions are needed for organizational change.

The three organizations - Maryland, Pennsylvania and Missouri - are relatively high on both of these functions (see Table 25). Missouri shows slightly higher scores on both dimensions, while Pennsylvania has the lower scores. Note, however, that in the three organizations the direction giving or "structure initiating" function is lower than the organizational climate. This can be explained by the strong non-directive tradition of Extension, which, however, makes it harder for Extension to innovate.

Table 25 - Leadership behavior

	Md. %	Pa. %	Mo. %
a. Organizational climate - consideration	70	67	76
b. Initiating and guiding action	68	66	75

REFERENCES

1. Sweezey, F.C. and J.J. Honigman. "American Origins of Community Development," Community Development, 1962, No. 10, pp. 165-76.

This is not to mean that the Cooperative Extension Service was the only institution in which activities of this type were conducted. Social work in urban areas is known to be engaged in similar activities.

2. Weitzell, E.C. "Implementing Community Resource Development Programs," FES, USDA, November 1968, pp. 1-11.

3. "A People and A Spirit," USDA-NASULGC Joint Committee Report, 1969, p. 54; Cummings, G.J. "A Survey of Viewpoints and Practices by Cooperative Extension Staff in CRD," 1968.

4. ECOP Report, Community Resource Development, 1967.

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG1 1973
on Adult Education